

- I. Claims 39, 41, 43-49, drawn to a composite, classified in class 428, subclass 457+.
- II. Claims 40, 42, 73-76, drawn to a composite with display medium, classified in class 428, subclass 1.1+.
- III. Claims 50-65, 70-72, and 77-78, drawn to a method of producing a composite display, classified in class 427, subclass 457+.”

### Remarks

The groups set forth above are severely out-of-step with the currently pending claims, in view of an apparent oversight at the PTO of the Further Preliminary Amendment filed on April 8, 2002 (see Attachment A). Note, for example, that only one of the nine claims listed for Group I is currently pending, and that claim (independent claim 39) no longer recites a “composite structure” but rather an “electronic display structure”. Independent claim 40 likewise was amended to recite an “electronic display structure”. Both claims 39 and 40 now recite “a plastic substrate”, as does independent claim 79 which is not even acknowledged by the Office Action.

Even taking into account the oversight of the Further Preliminary Amendment, the Restriction Requirement is confusing on several counts. The distinction made between Group I and Group II is that Group II is not simply a composite, but a composite “with a display medium”. However, originally submitted claims 39 (associated with Group I) and 40 (associated with Group II) *both* recite “a display structure”. Further, subclass 1.1+ (from the Manual of Classification, a “[p]roduct which specify the composition of at least one layer in a liquid crystal optical display”) is referenced under Group II, even though originally submitted claim 40 (associated with Group II) does not specify the composition of the substrate and originally submitted claim 39 (associated with Group I) does specify a “plastic substrate”. It is also pointed out that neither claim 39 nor 40, as originally submitted, was limited to a *liquid crystal* optical display.

Applicants respectfully request either a withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement or a clarification thereof, so that a meaningful election can be made.

**Election with Traverse**

In compliance with Rule 143, Applicants elect Group II with traverse in view of the remarks above. In the absence of clarification, Applicants presume that all pending article claims (39-40, 73-76, and 79-114) correspond to the election.

**Conclusion**

Applicants have elected Group II with traverse for the reasons given.

No fees are believed to be due by submission of this paper. If this belief is in error, please charge any required fees to Deposit Account No. 13-3723. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the indicated telephone number with questions that can be resolved with a simple teleconference.

Respectfully submitted,

April 14, 2003  
Date

By: Stephen C. Jensen  
Stephen C. Jensen, Reg. No.: 35,207  
Telephone No.: (651) 736-3369

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833